



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/718,498	11/24/2000	Renford Heaysman	367.39322X00	2503

20457 7590 12/29/2003

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889

EXAMINER

MILLER, BRANDON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

17

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TS

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/718,498

Applicant(s)

HEAYSMAN, RENFORD

Examiner

Brandon J Miller

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2003.

2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.

2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-14 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-14 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metroka in view of Peuhu.

Regarding claim 1 Metroka teaches a radiotelephone handset, including a display and a keypad; a cover movable between a closed position and an open position in which the keypad is accessible to the user; and means for lighting the display and keypad in response to the position the cover (see col. 9, lines 54-60 and FIG. 1). Metroka does not specifically teach lighting the display and keypad to an extent limited by the position of the cover. Peuhu teaches lighting a display to an extent limited by the segments of the display that become visible (see col. 4, lines 32-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the invention adapt to include lighting the display and keypad to an extent limited by the position of the cover because this would allow for an improved display and keypad operation in a portable radiotelephone handset with an open/close type display.

Regarding claim 3 Metroka and Peuhu teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for a cover that when in a closed position, all the keys of a keypad, but not the display, are obscured by a cover and providing lighting to a display when a cover is in a closed position. Metroka does

teach a cover that when in a closed position, all of the keys of the keypad, but not the display, are obscured by the cover (see col. 7, lines 58-60). Metroka does teach and providing light to a display when a cover is in a closed position (see col. 7, lines 44-51). It would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the invention adapt to include a cover that when in a closed position, all the keys of a keypad, but not the display, are obscured by a cover and providing lighting to a display when a cover is in a closed position because this would allow for a radiotelephone handset with an open/close type display in which information can be seen from a closed state.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metroka in view of Peuhu and Ulveland.

Regarding claim 2 Metroka and Peuhu teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for a cover that when in a closed position, the display and all the keys of the keypad are obscured by the cover, and a cover that when in a closed position, the lighting means is not operable to provide any light. Ulveland teaches a cover for a radiotelephone that is movable from between a closed position and an open position and that when in a closed position the display and all the keys of the keypad are obscured by the cover (see col. 3, lines 38-45 and FIGS. 2-4). Metroka does teach a cover that when in a closed position, has lighting means, which is not operable to provide any light (see col. 7, lines 43-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the invention adapt to include a cover that when in a closed position, the display and all the keys of the keypad are obscured by the cover, and a cover that when in a closed position, the lighting means is not operable to provide any light because this would allow for control of back-light lamps in a flip-type portable telephone.

Claims 4-7 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metroka in view of Peuhu and Nagai.

Regarding claim 4 Metroka and Peuhu teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for a cover that when in a closed position, has some but not all of the keys of a keypad and not the display obscured by a cover and when the cover is in a closed position, the lighting means can light only the display and those keys of the keypad not obscured by a cover. Nagai teaches a cover that when in a closed position, has some but not all of the keys of a keypad obscured by a cover (see col. 2, lines 10-14). Nagai also teaches a sliding cover for a portable phone able to obscure part of a housing body and keypad by slidably moving the cover through curved surfaces (see pg. 7, lines 40-58 and Fig. 7). Metroka does teach lighting a display to an extent limited by the position of a cover (col. 9, lines 54-58). Peuhu does teach a display lighting means that only lights part of a display (see col. 4, lines 32-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the invention adapt to include a cover that when in a closed position, has some but not all of the keys of a keypad and not the display obscured by a cover and when the cover is in a closed position, the lighting means can light only the display and those keys of the keypad not obscured by a cover because this would allow for a radiotelephone handset with an open/close type display in which information can be seen from a closed state.

Regarding claim 5 Nagai teaches a radiotelephone handset with a cover that has a slide (see pg. 7, lines 39-43).

Regarding claim 6 Nagai teaches a radiotelephone handset with a cover that has a flip (see pg. 30-38).

Regarding claim 7 Metroka teaches a method of controlling a radiotelephone handset including a user-movable cover and user input interface lighting, wherein the user input interface lighting is activated only when the user input interface is not hidden by the cover as determined by a detected position of the cover (see col. 9, lines 54-58). Metroka does not specifically teach portions of the user interface not hidden by the cover as determined by a detected estimate of the position. Peuhu teaches lighting a display to an extent limited by the segments of the display not hidden as determined by a detected estimate of its position (see col. 4, lines 32-35). Nagai teaches a cover that when in a closed position, has some but not all of the keys of a keypad obscured by a cover (see col. 2, lines 10-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include portions of the user interface not hidden by the cover as determined by a detected estimate of the position because this would allow for an improved display and keypad operation in a portable radiotelephone handset with an open/close type display.

Regarding claim 10 Metroka teaches a radiotelephone handset, including a display and a keypad; a cover movable between a closed position and an open position in which the keypad is accessible to the user; and means for lighting the display and keypad in dependence upon the position the cover (see col. 9, lines 54-60 and FIG. 1). Metroka teaches lighting means that are only operable when the keypad is not hidden by the cover (see col. 7, lines 46-49). Metroka does not specifically teach a portion of a keypad that is hidden by the cover as determined by an estimate of the position of the cover. Peuhu teaches lighting a display to an extent limited by the segments of the display not hidden as determined by a detected estimate of its position (see col. 4, lines 32-35). Nagai teaches a cover that when in a closed position, has some but not all of the

keys of a keypad obscured by a cover (see col. 2, lines 10-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the invention adapt to include lighting the display and keypad to an extent limited by the position of the cover because this would allow for an improved display and keypad operation in a portable radiotelephone handset with an open/close type display.

Regarding claim 11 Metroka teaches a radiotelephone handset, including a display and a keypad; a cover movable between a closed position and an open position in which the keypad is accessible to the user; and means for lighting the display and keypad in dependence upon the position the cover (see col. 9, lines 54-60 and FIG. 1). Metroka teaches lighting means that are only operable when the keypad is not hidden by the cover (see col. 7, lines 46-49). Metroka does not specifically teach a keypad in a first position, illuminating a first portion of a keyboard and display while a second portion of the keypad remains without illumination, and, when the cover is in a second position, illuminating the first and second portions of the keypad. Peuhu teaches illuminating a first portion of a display while a second portion of the display remains without illumination, and when the display is in a second position, illuminating the first and second portions of the display (see col. 4, lines 21-24 & 32-35). Nagai also teaches a sliding cover for a portable phone able to obscure part of a housing body and keypad by slidably moving the cover through curved surfaces (see pg. 7, lines 40-58 and Fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the invention adapt to include a keypad in a first position, illuminating a first portion of a keyboard and display while a second portion of the keypad remains without illumination, and, when the cover is in a second position, illuminating the first and second portions of the keypad because this would allow for an

Art Unit: 2683

improved display and keypad operation in a portable radiotelephone handset with an open/close type display.

Regarding claim 12 Nagai teaches a sliding cover for a portable phone able to move between multiple positions between a closed and fully open position (see pg. 7, lines 40-58 and Fig. 7).

Regarding claim 13 Nagai teaches radiotelephone with a cover in the fully open position (see pg. 7, lines 40-58 and Fig. 7).

Regarding claim 14 Nagai teaches a sliding cover for a portable phone able have a first portion of a keypad exposed, while the second portion of the keypad is covered (see pg. 7, lines 40-58 and Fig. 7).

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 and 10-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

He U.S. Patent 6,323,849 discloses a display module with reduced power consumption.

Hattori U.S. Patent 5,638,441 discloses a portable telephone apparatus with rotatable cover allowing enhanced option key access.

Miyashita European Patent 0 682 434 discloses a portable telephone set.

Crisp U.S. Patent 6,282,436 discloses a portable telephone.

Art Unit: 2683

Boesen U.S. Patent 6,542,721 discloses a cellular telephone person digital assistant and pager unit.

Lee U.S. Patent 6,243,595 discloses a portable wireless communication device having an extendible section.

Bowen U.S. Patent 6,052,606 discloses a reversible keypad and display for a telephone handset.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon J Miller whose telephone number is 703-305-4222. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

December 18, 2003


WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600